



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------

09/280,541 03/30/99 HO

J P55657

008439
ROBERT E. BUSHNELL
1522 K STREET NW
SUITE 300
WASHINGTON DC 20005-1202

TM02/0410

EXAMINER

NGUYEN, K

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2674

DATE MAILED:

04/10/01

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/280,541

Applicant(s)

HO, JAE-ICK

Examiner

Kevin M. Nguyen

Art Unit

2674

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136 (a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 11 January 2001.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claims _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are objected to by the Examiner.
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e).

Attachment(s)

- 15) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 16) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 17) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____
- 18) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____
- 19) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 20) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

1. The amendment filed on 01/11/2001 is entered. However, Claims 1-20 have been rejected in view of the newly discovered prior art of Anderson et al. (6,108,787) and Merrell (4,263,647) below.
2. The corrected or substitute drawings were received on 01/11/2001. These drawings are approved.

Specification

3. The substitute specification filed 01/11/2001 has not been entered because it does not conform to 37 CFR 1.125(b) because: amendment to the specification is too long. Need a new substitute to specification.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

4. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent, or on an international application by another who has fulfilled the requirements of paragraphs (1), (2), and (4) of section 371(c) of this title before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent.

5. Claims 1, 4 and 9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Clement (US Patent No. 5,726,668).
6. As to claim 1, Clement teaches a manufacturing process control system 62 and display system 42, 44, 46 which includes any of a variety of data input devices 76, 78 and 80 (column 5, lines 19-20), Bulb Driver Board 100 (fig. 22 and 21, col. 16, lines 59-67), I/O interfaces 70, 72, 74 (column 5, lines 12-13), the controller for each of UART

Art Unit: 2674

Channel A (the primary communication path), UART Channel B (the secondary communication path) (column 11, lines 16-24).

7. As to claim 4, Clement teaches a CPU 180 (col. 15, line 1) including a programmable logic device (PLD) 184 is programmed to server as the address decoder and logic decoder for the two channel (column 15, lines 4-6).

8. As to claim 9, Clement teaches a particular alarm (fig. 13, col. 14, line 20).

9. Claims 2, 3 and 6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Clement in view of Anderson et al. (6,108,787).

10. As to claims 2, 3 and 6, Clement teaches all of the claimed limitations of claim 1, except for the inputting devices and a switch to select one of the mouse and the scanner. However, Anderson et al. teaches a computer network system including A further port 30 connects the switch means 20 to an information input device 32 which in this embodiment comprises a keyboard but which may also be a pointing device (mouse or a keyboard and mouse combination), a scanner, or any other form of information input device suitable for the task at hand (fig. 3, col. 6, lines 49-54). It would have been obvious to utilize a switch to select one of the mouse and the scanner taught by Anderson in the display data channel of Clement's system because would allow the user to select the information data between computer networks having different of display (col. 1, lines 6-8 of Anderson).

11. Claims 5, 7, 8, 10, 11 and 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Clement in view of Merrell et al. (4,263,647).

12. As to claims 5 and 17, Clement teaches all of the claimed limitation of claim 1, except for a Zener diode, a transistor, a relay and LED. However, Merrell teaches a related monitor control system including a Zener diode 571, switch 200 corresponds to transistor as claimed (figure 6), a relay coil 574 (figure 18), and LED 172 and 177 (figure 6). It would have been obvious to utilize a Zener diode 571, switch 200, a relay coil 574, and LED 172 taught by Merrell in the display data channel of Clement's system because this would allow the user to insure that the controlled machine tool is brought to a stop and the operator alert (col. 1, lines 50-51 of Marrell).

13. As to claims 7 and 8, Merrell teaches a watch dog timer 170 (fig.6) to determine a first predetermined time and a second predetermined time (col. 25, lines 45-50).

14. As to claim 10, Merrell teaches a reset switch 581 is connected in parallel with the relay contacts 578 and is mounted on the pendant control station 2 (col. 29, lines 20-23).

15. As to claim 11, Merrell teaches main processor controls the relay coil (figure 18).

16. As to claims 12-20, refer to the previous rejections as applied to claims 1-11

17. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-20 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

18. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. See PTO-892 form.

19. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Kevin M. Nguyen whose telephone number is 703-305-


6209. The examiner can normally be reached on MON-FRI from 9:00-5:00 with alternate Friday off.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Richard A Hjerpe can be reached on 703-305-4709. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are 703-308-9051 for regular communications and 703-308-6606 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-305-4700.

Kevin M. Nguyen
Examiner
Art Unit 2674

KN
April 6, 2001



RICHARD HJERPE
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600